

Before the
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
Washington, DC 20554

RECEIVED

JAN 4 1993

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

In the Matter of)
)
Rules and Regulations Implementing)
the Telephone Consumer Protection)
Act of 1991)

CC Docket No. 92-90

ORIGINAL
FILE

GTE's COMMENTS IN SUPPORT OF U S WEST's
PETITION FOR CLARIFICATION
OR RECONSIDERATION

GTE Service Corporation and
its domestic affiliated
telephone, equipment
and service companies

Richard McKenna HQE03J36
GTE Service Corporation
P.O. Box 152092
Irving TX 75015-2092
(214) 718-6362

Daniel L. Bart
1850 M Street NW
Suite 1200
Washington DC 20036
(202) 463-5212

January 4, 1993

Their Attorneys

Before the
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
Washington, DC 20554

RECEIVED

JAN 4 1993

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

In the Matter of)
)
Rules and Regulations Implementing) CC Docket No. 92-90
the Telephone Consumer Protection)
Act of 1991)

GTE's COMMENTS IN SUPPORT OF U S WEST's
PETITION FOR CLARIFICATION
OR RECONSIDERATION

GTE Service Corporation, on behalf of its domestic affiliated, telephone, equipment, and service companies ("GTE"), hereby submits the following Comments in Support of U S West's Petition For Clarification or Reconsideration filed November 23, 1992¹ and addressed to the Commission's Report and Order (the "October 16 Order"), FCC 92-443 released October 16, 1992, adopting specific Rules designed to implement the Telephone Consumer Protection Act of 1991 ("TCPA"), Public Law 102-243,

¹ U S West's Petition was listed on Report No. 1921 (Dec. 15, 1992), PETITIONS FOR RECONSIDERATION AND CLARIFICATION AND PETITION FOR STAY OF ACTIONS IN RULE MAKING PROCEEDINGS. The Petition was set for public comment by public notice in the Federal Register, 57 Fed. Reg. 60,202 (1992).

which added a new Section 227 to Title II of the Communications Act.²

DISCUSSION

GTE SUPPORTS U S WEST'S PETITION ASKING THAT A MESSAGE PROVIDER -- REGARDLESS OF WHETHER IT IS A "CARRIER" -- SHOULD NOT BE SUBJECT TO THE STATUTORY IDENTIFICATION REQUIREMENT OR OTHERWISE LIABLE UNDER TCPA OR THE FCC'S RULES.

One area in which GTE does business is selling systems or providing networks which forward voice or facsimile messages whereby GTE acts only as an intermediary. In so acting, GTE may be strictly within its "carrier" capacity and/or acting as an unregulated enhanced service provider. In any case, GTE has no knowledge of message content; its knowledge is limited to the point(s) to which the message is to be forwarded, as its function is limited to getting the message to such point(s). In asking for clarification, U S West's Petition (at 6) notes the "voice messaging provider is not responsible for its participation in delivering . . . a prerecorded or artificial voice message that does not comply with the TCPA or the Commission's rules." Similarly, U S West (*id.*) says: "[t]he Commission should provide the same kind of clarification with regard to facsimile platform/broadcast providers."

² By an Order released December 18, 1992, DA 92-1717 (Dec. 18, 1992), the Chief of the Common Carrier Bureau denied requests for Stay or Deferral of Effective Date of Certain Requirements of the October 16 Order. Thus, the October 16 Order generally became effective on December 20, 1992.

These services -- providing voice messaging and facsimile broadcast -- are very similar in that there is no feasible way to monitor every voice or facsimile message passing over a service provider's network. And this reality is not changed by whether the service provider is formally qualified under federal or state regulation as a common carrier."³ Under these circumstances, U S West's Petition (at 8) is correct in observing that the "'identification' that occurs (i.e., the [statutory] date/time identification, as well as the identification of the business or other entity 'sending' the facsimile message) is [of] the author of the message content and not an intermediate facsimile transport/broadcast provider." Footnote omitted. GTE supports U S West's position that a service provider -- whether operating as a carrier or non-carrier -- that is only a "middleman" sending the messages to their destination should not be held responsible for the content of such messages.

Accordingly: GTE joins U S West in suggesting to the Commission: (i) that the intent of the statute, is that "middleman" service providers, whether "carriers" or not, need

³ See NARUC v. FCC, 525 F.2d 630, 641-42 (D.C. Cir. 1976), cert. denied, 425 U.S. 992 (1976). The "holding out" standard has to do with the form of commercial relationship with a service provider's customers. A service provider that performs a pure intermediary function may deal with its customers on the basis of "individualized decisions, in particular cases, whether and on what terms to deal", and therefore not qualify as a "carrier." Id., 525 F.2d at 641, footnote omitted. Whether a service provider is recognized as a carrier at the state level will depend on the applicable provisions of state law.

not comply with the statutory identification requirement; and
(ii) proposed Rule Section 68.318(c) should clearly reflect this
intent, and (iii) mere "middlemen" should not be liable under the
TCPA or the Commission's rules for a transmission that does not
comply with the statute or the rules.

Respectfully submitted,

GTE Service Corporation and
its domestic affiliated
telephone, equipment
and service companies

Richard McKenna HQE03J36
GTE Service Corporation
P.O. Box 152092
Irving TX 75015-2092
(214) 718-6362



Daniel L. Bart
1850 M Street NW
Suite 1200
Washington DC 20036
(202) 463-5212

January 4, 1993

Their Attorneys

Certificate of Service

I, Ann D. Berkowitz, hereby certify that copies of the foregoing "GTE's Comments" have been mailed by first class United States mail, postage prepaid, on this 4th day of January, 1993 to all parties on the attached list.



Ann D. Berkowitz

Richard J. Arsenault
Attorney
Hopkins & Sutter
888 Sixteenth Street, NW
Washington, DC 20006

J. Hal Berge
Telecommunications Industry Association
2001 Pennsylvania Ave., NW
Washington, DC 20006

George Borsari, Jr.
Attorney
Borsari & Paxson
2033 M Street, NW
Suite 630
Washington, DC 20036

A. Thomas Carroccio
Attorney
Santarelli, Smith, Kraut & Carroccio
1155 Connecticut Ave., N.W.
9th Floor
Washington, DC 20036

James R. Cooke
Attorney
Harris, Beach & Wilcox
1611 North Kent Street
Suite 1000
Arlington, VA 22209

Stuart S. Gunckel
Attorney
US West, Inc.
1020 19th Street, NW
Washington, DC 20036

Suzanne Heaton
Staff Vice President
Consumer Electronics Group
Electronic Industries Association
2001 Pennsylvania Ave., NW
Washington, DC 20006

Bruce D. Ryan
Paul, Hastings, Janofsky & Walker
1050 Connecticut Ave., NW
12th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20036

Ian D. Volner
Attorney
Cohn and Marks
Suite 600
1333 New Hampshire Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20036-1573